

Appln. No. 09/966,533  
Amendment dated August 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 3, 2007

### REMARKS

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4 through 23, and 25 through 27 remain in this application. Claims 2, 3 and 24 have been cancelled. No claims have been withdrawn or added.

Claims 1 and 4 through 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sands in view of Scheuring and further in view of Nazanin.

Claim 1 requires, in part, "wherein said scheduling circuit structure is configured to require, upon receiving the incoming telephone call and after said identifying caller information for the incoming telephone call is provided to the user upon receipt of the incoming telephone call, an indication from the user that a call-back should be scheduled".

Claim 10 requires similarly, but not identically, "requesting from the recipient of the incoming call, after receiving the incoming call and providing the caller information to the recipient of the incoming call, to an indication of whether the first device should initiate an automatic scheduling of a call-back for the incoming telephone call by the first device based on the caller information provided to the recipient".

Also similarly but not identically, claim 15 requires "means for requesting the recipient of the incoming communication to indicate, after receiving the incoming communication and presenting the identifying information to the recipient, whether to automatically schedule a response to the incoming communication based on information identified by said identifying means."

Appln. No. 09/966,533  
Amendment dated August 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 3, 2007

The amendments to claims 1, 10 and 15 are based upon the requirements of claim 24 (now cancelled), which was not specifically addressed in the rejection of the Office Action. It is submitted that none of the art cited against the claims of the application in the present Office Action discloses this combination of features.

Further, it is conceded in the rejection of the Office Action that neither Sands nor Scheuring teach "the prompting unit means to remind one to callback a caller". It is then asserted that:

However note that Nazanin et al. teach such (see Abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have incorporated such a means as taught by Nazanin et al. into the Sands/Scheuring systems as an obvious added-value.

However, it is submitted that simply because the addition of a feature would "add value" (if true) is not a sufficient motivation to combination the features of different teachings, as combining or adding a feature to an existing product virtually always adds value, otherwise why would one of ordinary skill in the art add the feature. In other words, such a broadly stated motivation could be used to justify any combination of any two features.

Withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 4 through 27 is therefore respectfully requested

Appln. No. 09/966,533  
Amendment dated August 3, 2007  
Reply to Office Action mailed May 3, 2007

### CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

WOODS, FULLER, SHULTZ & SMITH P.C.



Date: August 3, 2007

Jeffrey A. Proehl (Reg. No. 35,987)  
Customer No. 40,158  
P.O. Box 5027  
Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5027  
(605)336-3890 FAX (605)339-3357